

with the type of articles to be picked up. Thus, in effect, one of the routes, such as R1 or R2, is apparently designated based on the articles to be picked up.

However, there is no response to a request for a destination as set forth in the claims of the present application. To the contrary, claim 1, for example, calls for providing a route from the user's current destination to a requested destination through the facility. In other words, the user simply enters a destination and the system provides the route.


On the contrary, in Komatsu, some type of advancement route is determined for operation "in accordance with the type of articles to be picked up and so forth." See column 2, lines 65 and 66. There is no requested destination and no providing of a route specifically to that destination. Instead, in Komatsu, all that is done is the cart has an advancement route up and down the aisles until it picks all the articles listed on the picking list.

Thus, claim 1 distinguishes because there is no providing of a route from the user's current position to a requested destination.

Therefore, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. The other claims are likewise in position for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 15, 2002



---

Timothy N. Trop  
Registration No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, Texas 77024  
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]  
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]

## **APPENDIX**

Please amend claim 1 as follows:

1 (Thrice Amended). A method comprising:

positioning a plurality of wireless tags around a facility;

providing a sensor, associated with a tag, said sensor to sense the tags to  
determine the position of [the] a user in the facility; and

providing a route from the user's current position to a requested destination  
through said facility.